

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-16 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,309,563 issued to Farrand et al and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,053 issued to Nouri et al.

Claim 1 recites the following:

receiving a data packet containing hardware control data from an alert proxy external to a client device;
parsing the data packet to determine specified control operations;
determining a current operating state of the client device;
determining whether execution of the specified control operations are permitted while the client device is in the determined operating state; and
executing the specified control operations if the execution has been determined to be permitted.

Farrand discloses a method for transferring messages from a network operating system to a system manager. Farrand does not disclose receiving a data packet containing hardware control data from an alert proxy external to a client device, parsing the data packet to determine specified control operations, determining a current operating state of the client device, and determining whether execution of the specified control operations are permitted while the client device is in the determined operating state.

Nouri discloses a system for resetting a server. Nouri does not disclose receiving a data packet containing hardware control data from an alert proxy external to a client device, parsing the data packet to determine specified control operations, determining a current operating state of the client device, and determining whether execution of the specified control operations are

permitted while the client device is in the determined operating state. Therefore, Nouri does not cure the deficiencies of Farrand.

Neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses receiving a data packet containing hardware control data from an alert proxy external to a client device, parsing the data packet to determine specified control operations, determining a current operating state of the client device, and determining whether execution of the specified control operations are permitted while the client device is in the determined operating state. These limitations are recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Farrand and Nouri.

Claims 2-7 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-7 are patentable over Farrand and Nouri for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 8 recites the following:

- a first electronic component;
- a bus;
- a sensor coupled to said bus and said first electronic component to sense events in said first electronic component; and
- a second electronic component coupled to said bus to conditionally cause said first electronic component to perform a plurality of functions through said sensor, via said bus, responsive to control operations from a source external to the apparatus.

As discussed above, Farrand discloses a method for transferring messages from a network operating system to a system manager, and Nouri discloses a system for resetting a server.

Neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses a sensor coupled to the bus and the first electronic component to sense events in the first electronic component. Furthermore, neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses a second electronic component coupled to the bus to conditionally cause the first electronic component to perform a plurality of functions through the sensor, via the bus,

responsive to control operations from a source external to the apparatus. The Office Action states that Nouri at col. 12, lines 50-62 discloses this limitation. However, the cited text of Nouri merely discloses that the microcontroller network 102 can perform various system administration tasks, such as monitoring the signals that come from server control switches, temperature sensors, and client computers. The cited text in Nouri does not disclose a second electronic component causing a first electronic component to perform a plurality of functions through the sensor and via the bus, in response to control operations from a source external to the apparatus. These limitations are recited in claim 8. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over Farrand and Nouri.

Claims 9-16 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 9-16 are patentable over Farrand and Nouri for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number
02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 2/6/04

Lisa Tom
Lisa Tom
Reg. No. 52,291

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with
the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient
postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

2/6/04
Date of Deposit
Annie Pearson
Notary Public Mailing Correspondence
Annie Pearson 2/6/04
Signature Date